



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,058	04/27/2001	Ian Cooper	D1815-00025 DIV1	3991

7590 10/14/2003
DUANE, MORRIS & HECKSCHER LLP
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7396

EXAMINER

RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA //

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/844,058

Applicant(s) *eb11*

COOPER ET AL.

Examiner

Ula Ruddock

Art Unit

1771

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Terrel Morris. (3)_____.

(2) Melanie Goddard. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 09 October 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: Newman and Pualson.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Serial number 09/844,058
Art Unit: 1771

Substance of Interview:

Discussed the 112 1st issue. It appears proper support for the newly claimed limitations to the sheath are found on page 12 lines 9-22. Discussed how the "broadest reasonable interpretation" of the instantly claimed invention consistent with the specification currently fails to exclude the disclosures of Newman and Paulson. It is agreed that the intermediate products and the process of applicant are different from that of the applied prior art. However, current evidence is not conclusive to demonstrate that the final products are different. To overcome, the instant figures were consulted and they clearly show how the distribution of the binder material is carefully controlled. Incorporating a more accurate/detailed description of the drawings into the specification could define the claims in such a way as to avoid the prior art. For instance, it is noted that in the instant invention binder material is always located between the yarns being bonded together, and such is not inherently the case in the constructions of the applied prior art.



Terrel Morris
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 1771